UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,653	04/16/2004	Garth Shoemaker	198821-368252	8479

27155 7590 08/27/2007

MCCARTHY TETRAULT LLP
BOX 48, SUITE 4700,
66WELLINGTON STREET WEST
TORONTO, ON M5K 1E6
CANADA

EXAMINER	
FAN, CHARLES C	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2609	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/825,653	SHOEMAKER, GARTH	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Charles C. Fan	2609	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. §.133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-40* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-40* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *16 April 2004* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) –
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *7/21/04*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the displaying a graphical user interface over the region for selecting at least one parameter for distorting at least one of the region must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The following title is suggested: "METHOD FOR GENERATING A DETAIL-IN-CONTEXT PRESENTION".

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected because the concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent in which is new in the art is unclear. Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure. See MPEP § 608.01(b). Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1-5, 8-16 and 19-40 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding to claims 1-5, 8-16, 19-22, 32, 33 and 37-40, the recitation therein is unclear, confusing and indefinite, because the step of displaying the presentation is missing. It is noted that without the aforementioned step, one of ordinary skill in the art cannot perform the function as claimed without undue experimentation.

Regarding to claims 23 and 32, it is not understood as to whether the "graphical user interface" is referred to the structural elements of the screen of the computer system, or the graphical user interface is referred to another structural element other than the screen of the computer system.

Regarding to claims 24 and 34, the antecedent basis for the recites the adjusted presentation" has not been clearly set forth.

Claims 25-31, 35 and 36 are rejected as being indefinite, because these claims are depended on the rejected parent claims 23 and 32 respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. Following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-5, 11-16, 22, 32-34, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Sinclair II et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0056899 A1).

In re claim 1, Sinclair II et al. discloses the method for generating a detail in context presentation for an original image displaying on a screen (191) of a computer system (110) by receiving a signal from a user through a position-tracking device (161) coupled to the computer system to initiate the generation of the presentation (Figure 6a), and distorting the original image to produce the presentation (Figure 7D, item 715). It is noted that the dictionary defines distort as "*T*o twist out of a proper or natural relation of parts; misshape. A magnifying glass is defined in distorting an image because it makes the area magnified out of proper relation of it parts". Hence, the magnification engine of Sinclair II et al. can be is used to distort the image. Further, Sinclair II et al. teaches the presentation having a distorted region to provide the user with detailed information for a region of the original image (Figure 7D, item 715), and the presentation is only a small region of the whole view as well as it provides detailed information of that area via increase visibility.

In re claim 2, the teaching of Sinclair II et al. discloses the establishing a lens surface for the distorted region; and, transforming the original image by applying a distortion function

defining the lens surface to the original image ([0047]). Moreover, Sinclair II et al.'s magnification engine has the lens surface and transformation of lens surface as defined by the manipulation of scale, which is the well-known feature of magnifying in which requiring a lens surface to enlarge objects.

In re claim 3, the teaching of Sinclair II et al. discloses the transformation includes projecting the presentation onto a plane ([0058]). It is noted that Sinclair II et al.'s magnified region is in a floating window, which is well known to be on another plane.

In re claim 4, the teaching of Sinclair II et al. discloses the signal includes a location for the lens surface ([0048]). Further, Sinclair II et al. provides a location via cursor movement that may alter the magnification source.

In re claim 5, the teaching of Sinclair II et al. discloses the signal includes direction for the perspective projection for the lens surface ([0048]). Moreover, Sinclair II et al. provides a location via cursor movement that may alter the magnification focus.

In re claim 11, the teaching of Sinclair II et al. discloses the screen includes a remote screen (180) coupled to the computer system by a network (170).

In re claim 12, the teaching of Sinclair II et al. discloses a method for adjusting a detail in context presentation for an image for display on a screen (191) of a computer system (110) by receiving a signal from a user through a position-tracking device (161) coupled to the computer system to adjust the presentation (Figure 6a, item 601 and 609), and distorting the original image to produce the presentation (Figure 7D, item 715). It is noted that the magnification engine of Sinclair II et al. can be is used to distort the image for the reasons set forth above. Further, Sinclair II et al. teaches the presentation having a distorted region to provide the user with

detailed information for a region of the original image (Figure 7D), and the presentation is only a small region of the whole view as well as it provides detailed information of that area via increase visibility.

In re claims 13, the teaching of Sinclair II et al. discloses the establishing a lens surface for the distorted region; and, transforming the original image by applying a distortion function defining the lens surface to the original image ([0047]). Moreover, Sinclair II et al.'s magnification engine has the lens surface and transformation of lens surface as defined by the manipulation of scale, which is the well-known feature of magnifying in which requiring a lens surface to enlarge objects.

In re claim 14, the teaching of Sinclair II et al. discloses the transformation includes projecting the presentation onto a plane ([0058]). Sinclair II et al.'s magnified region is in a floating window, which is well known to be on another plane.

In re claim 15, the teaching of Sinclair II et al. discloses the signal includes a location for the lens surface ([0048]). Further, Sinclair II et al. provides a location via cursor movement that may alter the magnification source.

In re claim 16, the teaching of Sinclair II et al. discloses the signal includes direction for the perspective projection for the lens surface ([0048]). Moreover, Sinclair et al. provides a location via cursor movement that may alter the magnification focus.

In re claim 22, the teaching of Sinclair II et al. discloses the screen includes a remote screen (180) coupled to the computer system by a network (170).

In re claim 32, Sinclair II et al. discloses the method for generating a detail in context presentation for an original image displaying on a screen (191) of a computer system (110) by

receiving a signal from a user through a position-tracking device (161) coupled to the computer system to initiate the generation of the presentation (Figure 6a), and distorting the original image to produce the presentation (Figure 7D, item 715). It is noted that the dictionary defines distort as "*T*o twist out of a proper or natural relation of parts; misshape. A magnifying glass is defined in distorting an image because it makes the area magnified out of proper relation of it parts". Hence, the magnification engine of Sinclair II et al. can be is used to distort the image. Further, Sinclair II et al. teaches the presentation having a distorted region to provide the user with detailed information for a region of the original image (Figure 7D), and the presentation is only a small region of the whole view as well as it provides detailed information of that area via increase visibility. Moreover, Sinclair II et al. discloses the signal includes a location for the lens surface ([0048]). Further, Sinclair II et al. provides a location via cursor movement that may alter the magnification source.

In re claim 33, the teaching of Sinclair II et al. discloses the establishing a lens surface for the distorted region; and, transforming the original image by applying a distortion function defining the lens surface to the original image ([0047]). Moreover, Sinclair II et al.'s magnification engine has the lens surface and transformation of lens surface as defined by the manipulation of scale, which is the well known feature of magnifying in which requiring a lens surface to enlarge objects.

In re claim 34, the teaching of Sinclair II et al. discloses the transformation includes projecting the presentation onto a plane ([0058]). Sinclair II et al.'s magnified region is in a floating window, which is well known to be on another plane.

In re claim 40, the teaching of Sinclair II et al. discloses the screen includes a remote screen (180) coupled to the computer system by a network (170).

8. Claims 1-6, 12-16, 23-25, 32-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mohan et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,425,137).

In re claim1, the teaching of Mohan et al. discloses the method for generating a detail in context presentation for an original image displaying on a screen of a computer system (104) by receiving a signal from a user through a position-tracking device (105) coupled to the computer system to initiate the generation of the presentation (1202), and distorting the original image to produce the presentation (Figure 2B). Further, Mohan teaches that the presentation can be magnification means which would be known in the art to provide the user with detailed information for a region of the original image (column 4, lines 41-50), and the presentation (Figure 2B, 204) is only a small region of the whole view as well as it provides users to see small details well.

In re claim 2, the teaching of Mohan et al. discloses the establishing a lens surface for the distorted region and transforming the original image by applying a distortion function defining the lens surface to the original image (column 4, lines 40-51)

In re claim 3, the teaching of Mohan et al. discloses the transformation includes projecting the presentation onto a plane (Figure 3, 303).

In re claim 4, the teaching of Mohan et al. discloses the signal includes a location for the lens surface (column 4, lines 52-65).

In re claim 5, the teaching of Mohan et al. discloses the signal includes direction for the perspective projection for the lens surface (from column 4, line 66 to column 5, line10).

In re claim 6, the teaching of Mohan et al. discloses graphical user interface over the distorted region for adjusting the lens surface by the user with the position-tracking device (903).

In re claim 12, the teaching of Mohan et al. discloses the method for adjusting (column 3 lines 62-65) a detail in context presentation for an original image displaying on a screen of a computer system (104) by receiving a signal from a user through a position-tracking device (105) coupled to the computer system to initiate the generation of the presentation (1202), and distorting the original image to produce the presentation (Figure 2B). Further, Mohan teaches that the presentation can be magnification means which would be known in the art to provide the user with detailed information for a region of the original image (column 4, lines 41-50), and the presentation (Figure 2B, 204) is only a small region of the whole view as well as it provides users to see small details well.

In re claim 13, the teaching of Mohan et al. discloses the establishing a lens surface for the distorted region and transforming the original image by applying a distortion function defining the lens surface to the original image (column 4, lines 40-51)

In re claim 14, the teaching of Mohan et al. discloses the transformation includes projecting the presentation onto a plane (Figure 3, 303).

In re claim 15, the teaching of Mohan et al. discloses the signal includes a location for the lens surface (column 4, lines 52-65).

In re claim 16, the teaching of Mohan et al. discloses the signal includes direction for the perspective projection for the lens surface (from column 4, line 66 to column 5, line10).

In re claim 17, the teaching of Mohan et al. discloses graphical user interface over the distorted region for adjusting the lens surface by the user with the position-tracking device (903).

In re claim 23, the teaching of Mohan et al. discloses displaying a graphical user interface (801, Figure 8a) over the region for selecting (816, Figure 8a) at least one parameter for distorting at least one of the region, the focal region and the shoulder region (column 4, lines 41-50) receiving a signal from the user through a position tracking device (109) coupled to the computer system (100) for adjusting the GUI to select at least one parameter, and distorting the region in accordance with a distortion function and at least one parameter to produce the presentation for display on the screen. Column 12, lines 1-17 and shown in Figure 8B in Mohan teaches and example of modifying a lens via series of mouse inputs.

In re claim 24, the teaching of Mohan et al. discloses that each lens that is created also is on a different plane (302 and 303 of Figure 3).

In re claim 25, the teaching of Mohan et al. discloses that the user can change the region of operation of existing lens objects. Mohan et al also teaches that the user can move the lens object (from column 4, line 66 to column 5, line 10).

In re claim 26, the teaching of Mohan et al discloses the method wherein at least one parameter includes as least one of: magnification for the region (column 4, lines 41 - 51), a size for the focal region (from column 4, line 66 to column 5, line 10), a size for the shoulder region; a shape for the focal region (from column 4, line 66 to column 5, line 10), a shape for the shoulder region; a location for the region within the original image (column 4, lines 52-65), and a location for the focal region relative to the shoulder region.

In re claim 32, the teaching of Mohan et al. discloses the method for generating a detail in context presentation for an original image displaying on a screen of a computer system (104) by receiving a signal from a user through a position-tracking device (105) coupled to the computer system to initiate the generation of the presentation (1202), and distorting the original image to produce the presentation (Figure 2B). Further, Mohan teaches that the presentation can be magnification means which would be known in the art to provide the user with detailed information for a region of the original image (column 4, lines 41-50), and the presentation (Figure 2B, 204) is only a small region of the whole view as well as it provides users to see small details well. Moreover, Mohan et al. discloses the signal includes a location for the lens surface (column 4, lines 52-65). Further, Mohan et al. discloses the signal includes direction for the perspective projection for the lens surface (from column 4, line 66 to column 5, line10).

In re claim 33, the teaching of Mohan et al. discloses the establishing a lens surface for the distorted region and transforming the original image by applying a distortion function defining the lens surface to the original image (column 4, lines 40-51)

In re claim 34, the teaching of Mohan et al. discloses the transformation includes projecting the presentation onto a plane (Figure 3, 303).

In re claim 35, the teaching of Mohan et al. discloses graphical user interface over the distorted region for adjusting the lens surface by the user with the position-tracking device (903).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

10. Claims 6, 17, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sinclair II et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0056899 A1) in view of Herndon et al. (US Pat. No. 6,249,290 B1)

In re claims 6, 17 and 35, it is noted that the teaching of Sinclair II et al. do not explicitly disclose the graphical user interface over the distorted region for adjusting the lens surface by the user with the position-tracking device as required. However, Herndon et al. provides a zooming graphical user interface via mouse commands can modify magnitude of zooming (from column 5, line 50 to column 6, line 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method of Sinclair II et al. with the feature of the GUI over the distorted region for adjusting the lens surface by the user with the position-tracking device as taught by Herndon et al., so as to affect the magnitude of zoom, because they are both magnification graphical user interfaces.

11. Claims 8, 19 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sinclair II et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0056899 A1) in view of Sakai (US Pat No. 5,828,575).

In re claims 8, 19 and 37, it is noted that the teaching of Sinclair II et al. do not explicitly disclose the two dimensional image or a three-dimensional model as required. However, it is noted that such feature of electronic image is an image represented as a two dimensional array of brightness values for pixels is old and well known. In addition, Sakai provides an application (Figure 18) that can zoom (92) on three-dimensional models (from column 60, line 64 to column 61, line 16). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to assert that images in Sinclair II et al. would be two-dimensional and to combine the method of Sinclair II et al. with the feature three dimensional model magnification as taught by Sakai, so as to solve the need to magnify the 3-D model as to get a better detail of the 3-D model.

12. Claims 9, 20 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sinclair II et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0056899 A1) in view of Gerhardt et al. (US Pat. No. 5,481,622).

In re claims 9, 20 and 38, it is noted that the teaching of Sinclair II et al. do not explicitly disclose eye-tracking device as required. However, Gerhardt et al. discloses an eye tracking means that controls a cursor on a computer screen (from column 8, line 54 to column 9, line 6). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sinclair II et al. with the feature of the eye-tracking device as taught by Gerhardt et al. as both Sinclair II et al. and Gerhardt et al. are directed to the method for generating a detail-in-context presentation for an original image for displaying on a screen, so as to manipulate the cursor by using a eye tracking device.

13. Claims 10, 21 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sinclair II et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0056899 A1) in view of Gerhardt et al. (US Pat No. 5,481,622) and Friedman et al. (US Pat No. 4891630).

In re claims 10, 21, and 39, it is noted that the teachings of Sinclair II et al. and Gerhardt et al. do not explicitly disclose an eye tracking device and a depth for the lens surface within the original image proportional to a focal depth for the user measured by the eye-tracking device. However, Friedman et al. discloses an eye-tracking device's problem of maximizing the depth of view can be achieved by having a lens move in order to focus the image of objects at various depths along the optical axis. As such eye-tracking systems to maximize the field of view would require a movement of the lens depth (column 1 lines 40-55). Hence, it would be obvious to one with ordinary skill to combine the teachings of Sinclair II et al. and Gerhardt et al. with the feature of the eye tracking device that varies the depth of the lens to maximize the depth of view achieved as taught by Friedman et al. as both Sinclair II et al., Gerhardt et al. and Friedman et al. are directed to the method for generating a detail-in-context presentation for an original image for displaying on a screen, so as to provide an virtual lens surface within the original displaying image.

14. Claims 8, 19, 28 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mohan et al. (U.S. Pat No. 5,425,137) in view of Sakai (US Pat No. 5,828,575).

In re claims 8, 19, 28, and 37, it is noted that the teaching of Mohan et al. does not explicitly disclose the two dimensional image or a three dimensional model. However, it is

noted that such feature of electronic image is an image represented as a two dimensional array of brightness values for pixels is old and well known. In addition, Sakai provides an application (Figure 18) that can zoom (92) on three-dimensional models (From column 60, line 64 to column 61, line 16). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to assert that images in Mohan et al. would be two-dimensional and to combine the method of Mohan et al. with the feature three dimensional model magnification as taught by Sakai, so as to solve the need to magnify the 3-D model as to get a better detail of the 3-D model.

15. Claims 9, 20, 29, 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mohan et al. (U.S. Pat No. 5,425,137) in view of Gerhardt et al. (US Pat. No. 5,481,622).

In re claims 9, 20, 29, and 38, it is noted that the teaching of Mohan et al. do not explicitly disclose eye-tracking device. However, Gerhardt et al. discloses an eye tracking means that controls a cursor on a computer screen (from column 8, line 54 to column 9, line 6). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Mohan et al. with the feature of the eye-tracking device as taught by Gerhardt et al. as both Mohan et al. and Gerhardt et al. are directed to the method for generating a detail-in-context presentation for an original image for displaying on a screen, so as to manipulate the cursor by using a eye tracking device.

16. Claims 10, 21, 30, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mohan et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,425,137) in view of Gerhardt et al. (US Pat. No. 5,481,622) and Friedman et al (US Pat. No. 4,891,630).

In re claims 10, 21, 30, and 39, it is noted that the teaching of Mohan et al. does not explicitly disclose an eye tracking device and a depth for the lens surface within the original image proportional to a focal depth for the user measured by the eye-tracking device. However, Friedman et al. discloses an eye-tracking device's problem of maximizing the depth of view can be achieved by having a lens move in order to focus the image of objects at various depths along the optical axis. As such eye-tracking systems to maximize the field of view would require a movement of the lens depth (column 1 lines 40-55). Hence, it would be obvious to one with ordinary skill to combine the teachings of Mohan et al. and Gerhardt et al. with the feature of the eye tracking device that varies the depth of the lens to maximize the depth of view achieved as taught by Friedman et al. as both Mohan et al., Gerhardt et al. and Friedman et al. are directed to the method for generating a detail-in-context presentation for an original image for displaying on a screen, so as to provide an virtual lens surface within the original displaying image.

17. Claims 7, 18, 27, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mohan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,425,137) in view of Microsoft Paint Version 5.1 made by Microsoft Corp. 1981 (hereinafter as Microsoft).

In re claims 7, 18, 27, and 36, it is noted that the teaching of Mohan et al. does not explicitly disclose at least a slide bar icon for adjusting a magnification for the lens surface, a bounding rectangle icon with at least one handle for adjusting a size and a shape for the focal region, a bounding rectangle icon with at least one handle icon for adjusting a size and shape for the shoulder region, a move icon for adjusting a location for the lens surface within the original image, a pickup icon for adjusting a location for the focal region relative to the shoulder region.

However, Microsoft discloses a bounding rectangle icon with at least one handle, which can adjust size and shape of the canvas, as well as a move icon, which can be for adjusting the location of selected objects. It would be obvious to one with ordinary skill to use Mohan et al. and combine Microsoft's bounding rectangle as a means to implement the command of changing size or shape and the move icon as a means to initiate the command to move the lens.

Conclusion

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Soohoo (US Pat. No. 5,754,348) discloses a graphical user interface for digital image magnification, which allows simultaneous viewing of magnified image and unmagnified context. Pyy (http://web.archive.org/web/20030217105558/magnifier.sourceforge.net/) discloses a virtual magnifying glass, which can control height width and magnification. Kojima (US Pat. No. 6,184,859) discloses a picture display apparatus for enlarging a portion of a picture displayed on a screen for display on the same screen

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles C. Fan whose telephone number is 571-270-3550. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joe Cheng can be reached on 571-272-4433. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CF
C Fan
8/15/07

JOE H. CHENG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER